

**Supported Ministry Vindicated.**

One of the headlights of our Church has written a letter to me that a supported and salaried ministry is substantially the same thing, and that it is of too minor importance to be further discussed. I admit that it is by no means essential to salvation, yet it is by no means one and the same thing. But if the Scriptures teach a salaried ministry why not and by all means have it! But if on the contrary if it teaches a supported one, then let us have that. We want the gospel always.

As the EVANGELIST'S correspondent advocate of a salaried ministry has shown the difference between a salaried or supported ministry. I need not make the distinction, suffice it to say that men who have tried both should plainly see the difference.

I am truly sorry that my article was construed to mean that our Bro. was after filthy lucre instead of after the souls. Such was not constructed by me, I am glad to say, for him. It is only a portion of scripture quoted against a salaried ministry.

Of course this must stand if it takes away the salary. This scripture is found in 1 Pet. 5: 2.

Our Bro. takes his condition in life as an example and uses it to condemn a supported ministry. This is not exactly right. If I should take a merchant who had adopted the cash system and by so doing had financially failed, as an example that the cash system is worthless and should not be maintained; it would not in the least condemn the system. Now to take a minister who has not succeeded financially in a supported ministry as an example that all who labor and have labored under it, have failed and will fail, is not a fair comparison. I do not mean to say that our Bro. has been any thing else then a grand success in God's work, for I have read of his great revivals in the church, and such has been an honor to himself, the church, and our God. I am indeed very sorry for our Bro. in his financial condition. But in many cases it is not the money that makes the man while in others it is the man that makes the money.

Bro. E. B. Shaver's works can be taken as an example that the supported or rather self-supported ministry can be made a success. He has never until since he has been placed in the missionary work received anything for his ministerial labors. He has in the last two years or more, taken into the church not fewer than 125 members. All done with grit, grace and godliness. What salaried minister can show a better work in so short a time without the name evangelist prefixed to his name. I know of none in Va. Those who have heard Bro. Shaver preach, I think can testify that he does not "kill time and bore the congregation to death with ignorance."

The question was asked where in Christ's teachings He or the apostles ever took a salary of the people. Luke the 10: 7, was referred to as Christ teaching a salary. This is the scripture: "And in the same house remain eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house." It seems to me that any one of ordinary intelligence can see that Christ told his disciples to remain in the same house eating and drinking, and should not go from house to house, for fear of being burdensome to the brethren in furnishing them board and lodging. He had reference to nothing else that I can see. If you read the preceeding verses you will find that Christ was instructing them in regard to their welfare in journeying about.

Phil. 4: 15, was quoted as Paul receiving a salary. The brethren gave to his necessities in his afflictions, and this has been constructed to mean salary. This is not the question whether Christ or the apostles taught to give to the necessities of the minister or the poor or sick or whether the apostles or Christ received support of the churches; but whether they taught and received a salary, I do not think any one can show that they did.

You may select two or three portions of scripture that has the words "wages" and "hire," but this is all the corn there is, and this must be sold as dearly as possible. Christ says in John 10: 13, "The hireling fleeth when the wolf comes, because he is a hireling, and careth not for the sheep." Christ here hints that the hireling is not the best of persons to have with the flock, as they are after the hire or wages and careth not for the flock. So we

can see that the hireling is not recommended by Christ.

I have plainly shown before this that Paul—and who is greater than he!—labored night and day that he would not be chargeable to any of the brethren. In Acts XX: 34. Paul says, "Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me." "Paul and Barnabas for special reasons labored with their hands occasionally, but continued in the mean time to draw their regular salary." Of course this quotation is not found in the Bible. Paul says he labored night and day that he might not be chargeable to any, and his hands had labored unto his necessities. Now what "other reasons" has Paul given for laboring, but to his necessities and that he might not be chargeable to any? What other "reasons" did he labor for?—not for an example to lazy men to work night and day! Does any really think so? Paul does not say so. Here is what he says: What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel. 1 Cor 9: 18. Then again, "Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me." 1 Cor. 4: 16. Again he says, the third time he comes to them and would not be burdensome to them, for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children.

Inasmuch as Paul has denounced those who do not work and Christ the Son of God did not take a salary, why should modern men advocate it. Are they greater than either Paul or Christ! Who is, or has been, greater than Paul the apostle? What minister has done more preaching endured more hardships, experienced more shipwrecks, labored night and day, imprisoned in chains? Yet we find Paul the chiefest of the apostles, the great teacher of doctrine, the wonderful orator and persuader, the one who labored more than all the other apostles. Who has endured more? And yet this very Saul of Tarsus condemns a salaried ministry—"I have used none of these things" 1 Cor. 9: apart of verse 15th. We might think reasonably after all the privations and environments that he was exposed to he would not object to considerable support.

"Paul did not need a salary." A minister who labors night and day and does not need a salary! Who does then—one who never or rarely ever labors at all?

In conclusion, I don't want to hinder the gospel of Christ, for Paul says suffer all things rather than hinder the gospel of Christ. Yet there seems to be a question with many people, whether a salaried ministry is gospel or not if it is I pray God forgive me, but so far I am not in the least convicted that it is gospel. If the Lord be God serve him. I have and expect to have as much love for the man who advocates a salaried ministry as one of my own faith, but as yet I can not believe in it. The spirit within me can not easily be restrained from revealing God's word as revealed to it.

G. A. COPP.

Fisher's Hill, Va.

**A Brief Review.**

Rightly considered I think every one of us must deem it quite a favor to be permitted through the columns of the EVANGELIST to express our ideas, and, also, lovingly to criticise those of dissenting views. I have attentively perused Bro. Mason's article on open communion, with much interest it was excellent. I wonder if any that have the mind of Christ, have aught to say against it? I think all that are loose from the traditions of the Elder must say amen to it. I wish all the productions that show their faces in the columns of a paper that bears the name EVANGELIST, bore such a spirit, and were so entirely in accordance with the teachings of holy writ.

The next article I noticed was the prolix exegesis on Eternal Punishment by a Hebrew and Greek scholar. I am sorry that I must say that I find no doctrine like his in the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Why did he not tell us that the Greek word rendered punishment in Matt. 25: 46, is from *Kolasis*, which comes from *Kolaso*: which Donnegan tells us "means properly a cutting off, or take from, etc. As *Kolasis* cannot convey a meaning wholly dissimilar to the word from which it is derived, it is but reasonable to suppose that Christ, by the use of this word, is threatening the sinner with everlasting extermination in contrast with the eternal life of the righteous from which the wicked are to be cut off. As David declares: "Evil doers shall be cut off." Liddell and Scott even define *Kolasis* (1) a pruning (cut-

ting off, etc.) The picture our Hebrew and Greek scholar gives of the wicked when cast into Gehenna "where they will groan on through all eternity" is terrible. It brings to mind Tertullian, who is said to be the first Christian writer who expressly asserted the unending torments of the damned. He was originally a pagan in belief and by birth an African. He was of a fierce, fiery, rigid temper—a fit man to father such a doctrine. He thus exults over the prospects of the pagan's burning in hell: "How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, when I behold so many proud monarchs, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness: so many magistrates who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquifying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians; so many sage philosophers blushing in red hot flames with their deluded scholars." After quoting this, Gibbon exclaims: The humanity of the reader will permit me to draw a veil over the rest of this internal description. But even this description has been surpassed in modern times, by believers in the same awful doctrine—in his next he will give us the interpretation of everlasting and eternal. Lovingly, I would ask him to do it a little milder—according to the scriptures.

JOHN REIFF.

Yerkes, Pa.

**The Cap.**

A query sent Elder Hays, of Va., by me was published in the *Gospel Messenger*, with his answer and it proved to be a failure. Honesty in our opinions sometimes leads us to suppose that what is done, and what we advocate must be correct; and, perhaps, if we are aspiring to be above the little ones, we may draw wrong conclusions from our situation and from these, in defending our idols, we may make assertions that will prove false.

Elder Hays made the statement that the plain covering worn by the G. B. sisters could be traced back through the uniformed churches to the Apostles. This statement called up my query, I wished to know of Bro. Hays if he meant the cap. Any one in reading his reply will see that he meant no such a thing; for he most ingloriously failed to prove it. His supposition was that he supposed that they wore the cap.

I have handled this subject very tenderly in my mind, and I should; because my mother, my grandmothers and all the good old sisters wore, died and were buried in it, believing it to be heaven ordained. But, there was something away down at the bottom of all this that I wish to see and understand, and the assertion made by brother Hays, which calls up my query gave me a clue to ascertain whether or no there was reasonable ground for me to believe the cap to be a matter of salvation, or test of church membership. But when a free and impartial investigation is made, I honestly and sincerely believe that there is no chance for the cap, as a matter of salvation, and hence it falls where it belongs. There was a time in my life, when I never doubted the essentiality of the cap as a covering. The great problem in my mind was, when I began to investigate, has the church the divine authority to legislate in behalf of its members in usages and customs not found in the New Testament, and enforcing the customs upon the sister. If you do not consent to wear the cap you can not be received into the church; and if you don't get into the church you won't go to heaven. The problem was solved by taking the infallible rule. In that rule there is nothing found that gives the least hint of the Apostles ever legislating for the church outside of Divine authority. Nowhere can we find where opinions, usages and customs, outside the New Testament scriptures, were ever made a test of fellowship with divine sanction. Now if we are correct, what is the result? Simply this: the cap that should be left entirely to the freewill of the sisters to reject, or otherwise has been made a test of fellowship, and stamped with the power of a. m. as a matter of salvation. All who refuse to obey this mandate are regarded as out of the church, or refused admittance, and according to the law of reasoning, from which there is no escape, they are doomed to eternal misery. We have no objection to the cap as a covering when left to the entire freewill of those who choose to wear it. We have no objection to the veil, neither the hat; for if the hat legally disqualifies and covers up the brothers head in time of prayer, surely the same would legally qualify and cover the head of the sisters in times of prayer. There are rules that won't work both ways, but this one I think will, without loss in value.

SAM. C. BASHOR.